



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/759,841

01/15/2004

Michael Wayne Graham

0687/74768-AA/JPW/GJG/JRM

8757

23432 7590 03/30/2011

COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
20th Floor  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

WHITEMAN, BRIAN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1635

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/30/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/759,841	GRAHAM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BRIAN WHITEMAN	1635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 172,176-179,181-186,188,190-193,195-197,199,200,202-205,207-209,211 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 172,176-179,181-186,188,190-193,195-197,199,200,202-205,207-209 and 211 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/6/11,12/9/10</u>  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/9/10 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

Art Unit: 1635

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 172, 176-179, 184-186, 188, 190-193, 199-200, 202-205, and 211 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fire et al. (US 6,506,559, of record) taken with Cowsert et al. (US 5,580,767, of record).

The claimed invention reads on making and using a double stranded DNA construct comprising a first nucleotide sequence that is identical to a target gene, a second nucleotide sequence that is identical to the first nucleotide and placed in inverted orientation compared to the first nucleotide sequence, a stuffer which separates and links the first and second nucleotide sequence, a promoter and transcription termination sequence, wherein all of the sequences are operably linked together. The construct reads on a hairpin element when the construct is expressed in a cell because the two sequences when expressed would result in making the hairpin. When two identical sequences in a DNA construct are expressed and one sequence is placed in inverted orientation that resultant product is a sequence with a hairpin structure. Thus, a region of the nucleotide sequence in the construct would be the loop segment of the resultant product with a hairpin structure and read on the stuffer fragment of the claimed construct.

Fire teaches a vector comprising a construct comprising a promoter operably linked to a nucleotide sequence comprising a sense strand and an antisense strand of the target gene (columns 4 and 7-9). Fire teaches that the dsRNA construct is an improvement over antisense, ribozyme technology used for inhibiting a target gene (columns 1-3). Fire teaches at least one strand is produced by transcription of an expression construct (columns 7-9 and 28). The construct comprises a regulatory region (e.g., promoter, enhancer, polyadenylation) and use to transcribe the RNA strand(s) (columns 8-9). The nucleotide sequence may be at least 25, 50, 100, 200, 300, or 400 nucleotides (column 8). Fire further teaches that a double stranded structure may be formed by either a single self-complementary RNA strand or two complementary strands (columns 4 and 7-9). In order to make the single self-complementary RNA strand, the skilled artisan would have to make a construct comprising two identical sequences, wherein the second sequence is placed in an inverted orientation to the first sequence. The resulting single self-complementary RNA strand would contain a hairpin structure comprising a loop. The loop is considered to be a "stuffer" sequence because a certain number of nucleotides of the construct would have to form the loop. The teaching of Fire et al. embrace self-complementary RNA strands of greater than 400 bases, e.g., 25 consecutive nucleotides were identical to a sequence of a region of a target gene and another 25 consecutive nucleotides were complementarity. In such a molecule, an arbitrary number of nucleotides associated with the inherent hairpin region of the RNA strand can be arbitrarily considered to be a stuffer fragment that links 25 complementary base pairs. The vector can be introduced

Art Unit: 1635

into a cell, including cells found in humans (column 9-10). A viral vector can be used as the vector (column 9). The target gene can be a gene expressed by a virus.

However, Fire et al. do not specifically teach a target gene selected from viral DNA polymerase, viral RNA polymerase, or a viral coat protein. NOTE: the provisional application for '559 discloses a target gene may be selected which is required for initiation of the disease or pathology.

At the time the invention was made, Cowser teaches an oligonucleotide for inhibiting RNA polymerase to reduce the proliferation of a virus (column 3). It is acknowledged that Cowser is directed to making and using a nucleic acid inhibitor possibly with a different mechanism of inhibiting/reducing expression of a gene, then the mechanism for dsRNA as contemplated by Fire et al. Fire et al. teach that dsRNA is an improvement over other nucleic acid inhibitors. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been obvious to try using the target gene for other nucleic acid inhibitors and studying whether there is an improvement using dsRNA compared to known nucleic acid inhibitor against the target gene.

In addition, at the time the invention was made, viral DNA polymerase and viral coat proteins were known for initiation of the disease or pathology of a virus. This would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to select a target gene selected from a viral pathogen, e.g., virus comprising a viral DNA polymerase, viral RNA polymerase, or a viral coat protein because these genes are required for initiation of pathology. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art could make a construct comprising a nucleotide sequence targeting expression of a viral polymerase with a reasonable expectation of success.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Fire et al. taken with Cowsert et al., namely to produce and use the claimed product. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching to study the inhibition of expression of a viral RNA polymerase of a virus in a mammalian cell infected with the virus and/or if it is more efficient than antisense oligonucleotides at inhibiting expression of a viral RNA polymerase. "The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results." See **KSR v. Teleflex**, 550 U.S. 398, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Fire taken with Cowsert, namely to produce an isolated mammalian cell comprising a construct comprising a structural gene encoding RNA polymerase of a lentivirus. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching to improve and/or study the efficiency of inhibiting the virus.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Fire taken with Cowsert, namely to produce an isolated mammalian cell comprising a construct comprising a structural gene encoding RNA polymerase of an immunodeficiency virus. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching to improve and/or study the efficiency of inhibiting the virus.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Fire taken with Cowser, namely to produce an isolated mammalian cell comprising a construct comprising a structural gene encoding RNA polymerase of a virus, wherein the gene is in an exon. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching to improve and/or study the efficiency of inhibiting the virus by targeting the exon.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Fire taken with Cowser, namely to produce an isolated mammalian cell comprising liposome or viral particle comprising a construct comprising a structural gene encoding RNA polymerase of a virus. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching since both are commonly used by one of ordinary skill in the art to successfully deliver a nucleic acid to a cell.

Therefore the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/09, 9/28/09, 6/8/10 and 12/9/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See response to applicant's argument in non-final rejection mailed on 3/9/10. No new arguments were provided that require a response and that were not already addressed in the non-final rejection.



### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 172, 176-179, 181-186, 188, 190-193, 195-197, 199, 200, 202-205, 207-209, and 211 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent No. 7,754,697 in view of Cowsert et al. (US 5,580,767, of record). Claims 1 and 2 of '697 recite:

1. A double-stranded synthetic DNA gene, comprising multiple copies of a structural gene region, wherein the structural gene region comprises a nucleotide sequence which consists of greater than 20 consecutive nucleotides and which is identical to a nucleotide sequence of a target gene in a eukaryotic cell, wherein one of the copies is placed in the sense orientation and another of the copies is placed in the antisense orientation operably under the control of a single promoter sequence which is operable in the cell, wherein the copy of the structural gene region placed in the sense orientation and the copy of the structural gene region placed in the antisense orientation are arranged so as to form an interrupted palindrome sequence which is operably under the control of the single promoter sequence, and wherein the structural gene region placed in the sense orientation and the structural gene region placed in the antisense orientation are separated by a sequence of nucleotides that is 50-100 nucleotides in length or 100-500 nucleotides in length.

2. The double-stranded synthetic DNA gene of claim 1, wherein the target gene is from a viral pathogen of a vertebrate animal cell.

The claims of '697 also recite an animal cell comprising the construct and method of using the construct.

However, the claims of '697 do not specifically teach a target gene selected from viral DNA polymerase, viral RNA polymerase, or a viral coat protein.

At the time the invention was made, Cowsert teaches an oligonucleotide for inhibiting RNA polymerase to reduce the proliferation of a virus (column 3). It is acknowledged that Cowsert is directed to making and using a nucleic acid inhibitor possibly with a different mechanism of inhibiting/reducing expression of a gene, then the mechanism for double stranded construct as claimed by Graham et al. Thus, one of

Art Unit: 1635

ordinary skill in the art would have been obvious to try using the target gene for other nucleic acid inhibitors and studying whether there is an improvement using dsRNA compared to known nucleic acid inhibitor against the target gene.

In addition, at the time the invention was made, viral DNA polymerase and viral coat proteins were known to one of ordinary skill in the art for initiation of the disease or pathology of a virus. This would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to select a target gene selected from a viral pathogen, e.g., virus comprising a viral DNA polymerase, viral RNA polymerase, or a viral coat protein because these genes are required for initiation of pathology. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art could make a construct comprising a nucleotide sequence targeting expression of a viral polymerase with a reasonable expectation of success.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the claims of '697 taken with Cowsert et al., namely to produce and use the claimed product. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching to study the inhibition of expression of a viral RNA polymerase of a virus in a mammalian cell infected with the virus and/or if it is more efficient than antisense oligonucleotides at inhibiting expression of a viral RNA polymerase. "The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results."

See **KSR v. Teleflex**, 550 U.S. 398, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the claims of '697 taken with Cowsert,

Art Unit: 1635

namely to produce an isolated mammalian cell comprising a construct comprising a structural gene encoding RNA polymerase of a lentivirus. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching to improve and/or study the efficiency of inhibiting the virus.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the claims of '697 taken with Cowsert, namely to produce an isolated mammalian cell comprising a construct comprising a structural gene encoding RNA polymerase of an immunodeficiency virus. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching to improve and/or study the efficiency of inhibiting the virus.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the claims of '697 taken with Cowsert, namely to produce an isolated mammalian cell comprising a construct comprising a structural gene encoding RNA polymerase of a virus, wherein the gene is in an exon. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching to improve and/or study the efficiency of inhibiting the virus by targeting the exon.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the claims of '697 taken with Cowsert, namely to produce an isolated mammalian cell comprising liposome or viral particle comprising a construct comprising a structural gene encoding RNA polymerase of a virus. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the

Art Unit: 1635

teaching since both are commonly used by one of ordinary skill in the art to successfully deliver a nucleic acid to a cell.

Therefore the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claims 172, 176-179, 181-186, 188, 190-193, 195-197, 199, 200, 202-205, 207-209, and 211 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 225-294 of copending Application No. 10/346,853. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both set claims read on a similar double stranded DNA construct and method of using the construct.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 172, 176-179, 181-186, 188, 190-193, 195-197, 199, 200, 202-205, 207-209, and 211 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 158-202 of copending Application No. 10/821,726. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both set claims read on a similar double stranded DNA construct and method of using the construct.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Whiteman whose telephone number 571-272-0764. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 to 4:00 (Eastern Standard Time). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor Heather Calamita can be reached on 571 272-2876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Brian Whiteman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1635